DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 579 EA 021 350

AUTHOR Long, Delbert
TITLE Educational Reforms in the Soviet Union. Special Studies in Comparative Education, Number Fourteen.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Comparative Education Center.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 69p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Division, Comparative Education Center, 428 Baldy Hall, SUNY at Buffalo, Amherst, NY 14260 ($6.00 postpaid).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Organizational Change
IDENTIFIERS *Soviet Education; *USSR

ABSTRACT

The Soviet school system is, and has been since its inception, a vital instrument of state policy. The Soviet political leaders of the 1980s, in an effort to improve their educational system, are implementing into the academic program the basic Soviet educational principles of: (1) promoting Communist Party policies; (2) coordinating school work with youth, community, and political organizations, and with industrial and agricultural enterprises; (3) combining polytechnical labor education, aesthetic education, and general education with moral education; (4) equating moral education with the Lenin communist ethical system; and (5) uniting academic and ethical knowledge with socially useful applications. School structure changes are included in the reform effort. First, children will complete 11 years of general education beginning at age 6. Second, vocational schools will be consolidated into one institution. And third, all students must acquire a skill proficiency in some common occupation. To accomplish these goals, a large number of talented people must be encouraged to enter the teaching profession, classrooms must be provided with technological equipment, and substantial funds must be provided. Examining the Soviet efforts at educational reform will provide valuable insights about imaginative educational methods and means in another society whose ends are so very different. (126 references) (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311579

Educational Reforms in the Soviet Union

Delbert Long

Special Studies in Comparative Education

COMPARATIVE EDUCATION CENTER

FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

Number Fourteen

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Altbach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 350

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Delbert H. Long

© Comparative Education Center
First Printing, November, 1985

Contents

Introduction — Philip G. Altbach	
Educational Reform in the Soviet Union	1
Structure of the Public School System	9
Polytechnical Labor Education	12
Problems	25
Instructional Process: Content and Methodology	27
Improvement of Textbooks and Teaching Methodology	35
Recruitment and Training of Teachers	38
Problems	41
Conclusions	44

Introduction

Educational Reform in the Soviet Union is the 14th in our Occasional Papers series and the first one by an author, Professor Delbert Long of the University of Alabama at Birmingham, who has not been directly associated with the Comparative Education Center at SUNY-Buffalo. We felt that Professor Long's subject, educational reform in the Soviet Union, deserves the kind of thorough attention that is exemplified in this paper. Debate concerning the nature and implementation of a thoroughgoing series of reforms is now taking place in the Soviet Union and these discussions have implications for current controversy about similar questions in the United States. One of the major current Soviet concerns is for the links between education and work and the adaptation of education to a rapidly changing labor market. In this regard, this echoes American worries about how education is to fit a changing economy and job market. Developments in Soviet education have not been highlighted in the Western education literature, not even in the field of comparative education, and it is important that we keep abreast of new trends in this important country. It is, in a way, hopeful that even a country with a centrally planned economic system has acknowledged problems in tailoring education to the job market and to vocational needs. It is also significant that the current wave of reform

in the Soviet Union has received such high level attention. Delbert Long provides an excellent overview of one of the most important debates regarding Soviet educational policy and practice to take place in several decades. His analysis has relevance to discussions in the United States as well.

Philip G. Altbach
Director, Comparative
Education Center

Educational Reform in the Soviet Union

On 28 August 1918 the founder of the Soviet state, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, proclaimed that a public school system "divorced from life and politics is lies and hypocrisy" and that the new school system must be "part of the struggle for overthrowing the bourgeoisie."[1] This behest did not fall on deaf ears. The Soviet school system is, and has been since its inception, a vital instrument of state policy. It is used by the Communist Party leaders not only to provide the state with the trained manpower necessary to make it an ever greater industrial and military power, but to mold youth into adults who do not question the right of Party leaders to control all property, control all institutions, control all forms of mass media--in essence, to control the thoughts, feelings, and actions of people. In giving the school system such an awesome responsibility, it is little wonder that Soviet leaders from Lenin to Gorbachev have given careful attention to educational matters and have mounted periodic campaigns to reform their country's educational system.

The first such campaign was initiated almost immediately after Lenin and his Bolshevik followers seized power in 1917. The tsarist school system inherited by the Bolsheviks was clearly inappropriate for a revolutionary state founded on communist principles. Many Bolsheviks considered it a despicable institution. They condemned the

hostile relationship between students and teachers and the excessive amount of homework and harsh punishment, unreasonable examinations, rote learning and drill.[2] But what most raised the ire of the Bolsheviks was their adamant conviction that the tsarist school system was an elitist, dual-track, religious- and academic-dominated system that served exclusively the interests of the privileged classes.[3]

The tsarist general education system was quickly dismantled and replaced with a single-track, secular "United Labor School" that, in theory if not always in practice,

* introduced free and compulsory general and technical education ("instruction in the theory and practice of the principal branches of production") for all boys and girls up to the age of seventeen;
* eliminated textbooks, homework, grades, examinations, corporal punishment, and teacher-dominated lessons;
* based its moral upbringing of children on communist, rather than religious, ethics;
* replaced lectures with more active, progressive methods of instruction.[4]

The progressive method of instruction most enthusiastically promoted by the Commissariat of Enlightenment (Narkompros) and its Commissar, Anatoli K. Lunacharskii, was the complex theme. Complex themes, such as "Work in the Home" and "My Community," were supposed to be socially significant and relevant to the child's environment and personal needs and interests. Each theme was to be studied under the broad headings of labor, nature, and society. Proponents of the complex

theme assumed that the 3 Rs and knowledge of the academic disciplines would be picked up incidentally during the study of one of the themes. Students in the United Labor School were also to be taught simple labor skills and were expected to engage in such socially useful labor as planting shrubs around the school and caring for the school vegetable garden. School children were to have a voice in running the school and teachers were to be their friends and helpers.[5] Such a school was supposed to reflect some of the educational ideas of Marx and Engels and of such progressive Russian and American educators as, respectively, Konstantin D. Ushinsky and John Dewey.

By the mid 1920s, the laissezfaire educational system established by the Narkompros began to receive sharp criticism from parents, teachers, labor leaders, and Party members. As a result, from 1924 to 1928 certain modifications in the United Labor School were made that enhanced the systematic organization and teaching of basic knowledge.[6] But, with the inauguration of the first five-year plan in 1928, which stressed rapid industrialization of the country, and the subsequent rallying of young people to help meet the objectives of the plan, these modifications were held in abeyance during the so-called "Cultural Revolution Period" (1928-1931). During the Cultural Revolution, the project method was widely utilized in the schools. This method was based on the assumption that students would gain knowledge while working with other students and adults in achieving one of the goals of the five-year plan, such as draining swamps (to eliminate disease) and eradicating drunkenness and illiteracy.[7] It was no doubt rewarding and exhilarating for youngsters to play a significant role in combatting

serious societal problems, but they were not learning mathematics and the sciences very well, and the emerging, industrial economy demanded thousands of highly trained engineers with a solid knowledge of these disciplines.

In a series of decrees in the early and middle 1930s,[8] the Soviet state and Communist Party insisted that schools provide students with systematic knowledge of the traditional academic disciplines. Students were to be obedient and to respect the authority of teachers. The project method was repudiated and the lecture became the basic teaching method. Grades, homework, examinations, textbooks were reintroduced, and grades eight and nine, which during the late 1920s had been transferred to technical schools, were restored to the general education school. (Grade ten was soon added.) The upper grades of the rejuvenated general education school were geared to academically talented students who were trained specifically for entrance into an institution of higher learning. And, finally, in 1937, labor training was officially abolished from the general education school curriculum.[9] In short, the new school, which with minor modifications remained intact until shortly after Joseph V. Stalin's death in 1953, had many of the same features as the detested tsarist school.

In the early 1950s, it became increasingly clear to Soviet leaders that the critical need of the economy was no longer for a greater number of university trained people (the educational system was now providing an adequate supply of such people), but for a greater number of semi-skilled laborers and middle-level trained technicians.[10] Yet the Soviet secondary school continued to train their students in the upper

grades only for admission into an institution of higher learning. This practice was increasingly subjected to criticism by political leaders. By the last half of the 1950s, the criticism had greatly intensified and become more blunt. Without mincing words, Nikita S. Khrushchev, Stalin's successor, and members of the Central Committee condemned Stalin's ten-year school for being snobbish, bookish, and remote from life.

Such condemnation was reflected in several decrees that demanded that the ten-year school become an eleven-year school that would provide students in grades nine through eleven not only with a general education but with a vocational skill that would enable most of them to assume a job in the local economy immediately upon graduation.[11] Those students who did not desire to continue their education in the secondary school could, upon completion of grade eight, enter a vocational school or a technicum, or go to work. Appropriately, the secondary school soon got a new name that, though ponderous, reflected what its functions were supposed to be: "Secondary General Education Labor Polytechnical School with Production Training."

In reflecting on the highlights of educational reform during the first four decades of Soviet rule, it is tempting to conclude that educational reform movements during this period consisted only in doing almost the opposite of what was done before. There is obviously some basis for this conclusion, but it must be heavily qualified for two reasons. First, educational reform proposals embodied in various Soviet decrees and resolutions are often imperfectly implemented, if not virtually ignored, in practice. Most Soviet teachers during the 1920s, for

example, were totally bewildered by the methodological directives from Narkompros and simply closed their doors and continued to teach as they had done in the tsarist schools.[12] The most glaring example, however, is the 1917 goal, previously noted, of providing free, compulsory education for all children up to the age of seventeen. Implementation of these ambitious goals has turned out to be a long, tedious struggle. Fees have been charged parents during a good portion of this struggle. Furthermore, in the 1930-31 school year, young people in the Russian Republic averaged only 3.9 years of schooling in urban areas and 3.0 years in the rural areas.[13] As late as 1972, the U.S.S.R. Minister of Education complained that fourteen to fifteen percent of Soviet children did not complete the daytime eight-year general education school.[14] These examples are given not to demean Soviet educational achievements, which are considerable, but to emphasize that a person should be very cautious in equating Soviet legislation on educational reforms with actual implementation of the proposed reforms.

The second reason for qualifying the above conclusion is that it overlooks the persistent influence on Soviet educational policy of such long-standing educational principles as:

* use of the school as an important weapon for promoting policies of the Communist Party;
* coordination of the work of the school with youth, community, and political organizations, and with industrial and agricultural enterprises;
* combination of polytechnical labor education with general education;

* combination of polytechnical labor education and aesthetic and general education with moral education;
* equation of moral education with the communist ethical system delineated by Lenin;
* union of academic and ethical knowledge with practical application in "socially useful" activities.

Each of these principles has been interpreted and implemented in the schools in different ways over the years--sometimes stressed, sometimes de-emphasized, sometimes ignored--but not one has ever been abandoned in theory.

Since the Khrushchev educational reforms of the late 1950s, there have been a number of educational decrees and resolutions, but none has called for a sudden, radical shift in educational policy. In general, educational legislation in the Soviet Union the past twenty-five years might be viewed as a continuing effort to improve not only the same phases of the educational system that would receive attention in any capitalist country (improvement of curriculum content, textbooks, teaching aids, education of teachers, etc.) but to implement in a more comprehensive, coordinated manner the six educational principles just mentioned. The Khrushchev reforms represented the first all-out effort to implement simultaneously all these principles, but for a number of reasons--the most important perhaps being competition for students among directors of general education, vocational, and technical schools, resistance of parents and plant managers, shoddy equipment, decline in scholarship, and lack of financial resources and adequately trained teachers--these reforms fell far short of expectations and a number of

adjustments were soon made. The eleven-year general education school, for example, reverted back to a ten-year school, and academic education in the senior grades was again emphasized and production training in most of the schools was eliminated.

Soviet political and educational leaders of the 1980s are again making a determined effort to improve all aspects of their educational system and to implement in practice, in a more coordinated, comprehensive manner, the six principles listed above. This effort has been receiving national attention in the past two years in the Soviet Union. According to G. A. Aliyev, a member of the Communist Party Politburo, 120 million people took part in discussion of the Soviet state's initial draft of the proposed educational reforms.[15] Since there are only a little over 276 million people in the Soviet Union, it is questionable that four out of every ten Soviet people participated in these discussions. But we should accept this claim with the same generosity as Huckleberry Finn's assessment of Mark Twain's veracity in The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. Said Huckleberry: "There was things which he stretched, but mainly he told the truth."

Recent Soviet educational reform proposals are outlined in general terms in the 12 April 1984 legislation titled "Basic Guidelines for the Reform of General Education and Vocational Schools" (henceforth cited as "Guidelines"), and in more specific terms in subsequent resolutions designed to implement some of the proposals of the "Guidelines."[16]

The Khrushchev educational reforms attempted to implement immediately substantive content and structural changes, some of which represented a radical departure from previous educational policy. In

contrast, the "Guidelines" and companion resolutions provide a long-range strategy for gradual implementation over a five- to ten-year period of innovations that have been for a number of years an integral part of Soviet educational thought, and on a limited or experimental basis, practice.

In this paper I describe and discuss the major components of the "Guidelines" and subsequent educational reform documents. The paper is divided into four sections: 1) Structure of the Public School System; 2) Polytechnical Labor Education; 3) Instructional Process: Content and Methodology; 4) Recruitment and Training of Teachers.

Structure of the Public School System

At present Soviet children begin school at the age of seven and attend the same general education school (obshcheobrazovatel'naia shkola) through the eighth grade. This school is organized into primary education (nachal'naia shkola), grades one through three; incomplete secondary (nachal'naia sredniaia shkola), grades four through eight; and complete secondary (sredniaia obshcheobrazovatel'naia shkola), grades nine and ten (eleven, in national schools where the native language is not Russian). All students must complete ten years of general education, but the last two years may be completed either in the general education school, a vocational school, a secondary specialized educational institution (srednee spetsial'noe uchebnoe zavedenie), or in an evening or correspondence school (respectively, vechernaia shkola, zaochnaia shkola).

The vocational schools are one- to three-year institutions. The three-year institutions provide students with a trade and a complete secondary education. Eighth grade graduates attending the short-term vocational schools must complete their secondary education in an evening or correspondence school.

The secondary specialized educational institutions, often called technicums (tekhnikumy), are four-year institutions that provide students with a complete secondary education and prepare them for a highly skilled job such as a medical technician or an elementary school teacher. Upon graduation from the eighth grade, most young people complete their secondary education in the general education school; but about forty percent enroll either in a vocational school or a secondary specialized educational institution, or go directly to work and complete their secondary education in a correspondence or evening school.[17]

The "Guidelines" call for three major changes in the structure just described. First, children will start school at age six, rather than seven, and will be required to complete eleven, rather than ten, years of general education. Elementary school will comprise grades one through four; incomplete secondary, grades five through nine; complete secondary, grades ten and eleven (twelve). Second, the vocational schools will all be consolidated into a single, relatively new, institution called a secondary vocational-technical school (srednee professional'-notekhnicheskoe uchilishche). The length of study in this school for ninth grade graduates of the general education school will be three years; for eleventh grade graduates, one year. Third, in order to receive a secondary school diploma, all students--even those in the

general education school--must acquire a skill proficiency in some common occupation. Thus, for all young people in the Soviet Union a universal eleven-year general education program is to be combined with universal vocational training.[18] Plans call for

* doubling the amount of time devoted to labor education in the general education school;[19]
* doubling the enrollment in vocational schools and technicums.[20]

There are several explanations for this strong emphasis of the Soviets on labor education:

* Labor education is an integral part of Marxist ideology. In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels proposed that academic education be combined with technical education.[21]
* In the Soviet Union labor is basic to moral development. As Lunacharskii pointed out in 1918, "A really thoughtful and experienced pedagogue cannot help but note that to all three questions: how to educate the will, how to form character, how to develop a spirit of solidarity--the answer is one magic word: labor."[22]
* The Soviet Union is currently experiencing a severe labor shortage.[23]
* Roughly two-thirds of the graduates of the Soviet secondary general education school go directly to work in some enterprise without any vocational training.[24]

* The annual growth of the economy is slowing down from about four percent annual growth in the 1970s to about two to three percent in the 1980s.[25]
* The productivity of Soviet workers is only fifty to sixty percent that of American workers, and agricultural productivity is only twenty to twenty-five percent of the U.S. level.[26]

The poor productivity of Soviet workers, of course, is not a new phenomenon. As Lenin noted years ago, "The Russian is a bad worker compared with people in advanced countries. . . . The task that the Soviet government must set the people in all its scope is--learn to work."[27] The urgency and magnitude of this task for Soviet leaders have not diminished over the years. The late Soviet leader Konstantin Chernenko, for example, constantly reminded his countrymen that "one should never forget the simple truth: to live better, we must work better,"[28] and Mikail Gorbachev in speech after speech drives home the idea that "quality of output should be a matter of not just professional, but national pride."[29]

Polytechnical Labor Education

As defined by Marx, polytechnical labor education "imparts the general principles of all processes of production, and simultaneously initiates the child and young person in the practical use and handling of the elementary instruments of all trades. . . ."[30] Marx's assumption that polytechnism should combine "teaching and learning about economic production with practical work experience"[31] was endorsed by Lenin and his education Commissar, A. Lunacharskii. It is a simple concept

that has generally been accepted by Soviet political and educational leaders from 1917 to the present. The problem, however, that has bedeviled these same leaders is not with the pristine concept of polytechnism but with the practical problem of determining how much emphasis should be given to the various components of the concept (knowledge of basic sciences and industrial processes, socially useful labor, production training, etc.) and how the concept should be applied in the public school system. Their inability to agree on these questions has resulted in much controversy. Nicholas DeWitt is no doubt right in asserting that "there is no aspect of Soviet education which has, past and present, caused so much controversy as polytechnical instruction."[32]

One of the reasons for the controversy is that Soviet educators have had to contend with some difficult pedagogical questions, such as: What general principles of production should be taught? In what courses and at what age level should they be taught? How should the principles be taught? What kind of practical experiences should be provided to assist students to apply the principles in a practical situation? What kind of training do labor teachers need and who should provide it? How can love of labor and respect for workers be instilled in students from all walks of life? There is obviously no easy answer to any of these questions.

Another reason for the controversy is that neither Soviet politicians nor educators have consistently agreed on how to respond to such philosophical questions as: Should the secondary general education school prepare its graduates for immediate employment in a common

occupation? Should technical training in the general education school be of a monotechnical or of a polytechnical nature; that is, should it be narrow vocational training that prepares a youngster for only one trade, or should it be a broader education that enables a worker to transfer without too much difficulty to any one of several related occupations?

A partial explanation for this lack of consistency in response to these pedagogical and philosophical questions is that educational theory and practice in the U.S.S.R., as in any country, is strongly influenced by powerful external forces. Perhaps the most significant of these forces in the Soviet Union is the manpower needs of the economy. According to Beatrice Beach Szekely, current editor of Soviet Education, "The manpower needs of the national economy take precedence over all other considerations in educational policymaking in the U.S.S.R."[33] The following sketch of the development of polytechnical labor education in the Soviet general education school suggests that there is considerable justification for this conclusion by Szekely.

The United Labor School, established in 1918, was divided into two levels. Level I provided a five-year course for students eight to thirteen; the second level, a four-year course for students thirteen to seventeen.[34] Lunacharskii gave the word labor in the title of this general education school clearly a polytechnical orientation. The goal of this school, as stated in the 16 October 1918 decree entitled "Basic Principles of the United Labor School" and signed by Lunacharskii, "is not at all to provide training in this or that trade, but to provide a polytechnical education that acquaints children in a practical way with

the methods of the most important forms of work, partially in a school training workshop or on a school farm, and partially in factories, plants, and so on."[35] In this same decree, Lunacharskii "energetically protested" against any attempt to introduce trade training into the level I school. He and other associates of like mind such as Lenin's wife, Nadezhda K. Krupskaia, believed that early specialized vocational training limited a child's career options.

Lunacharskii argued that career options would remain open for a polytechnically trained youth of fourteen because a person so trained could "easily master any specialization."[36] Lunacharskii had so little interest in monotechnical training in either the general or vocational school that he eliminated the lower-level vocational schools that typically accepted Level I graduates.[37] This action and his general indifference to vocational training, of course, raised the ire of vocationalists, some of whom went to the other extreme. They demanded that polytechnism be replaced with monotechnism and that the age for student enrollment in specialized vocational training be lowered to twelve.[38] If such a proposal had been implemented, it would have essentially done away with Level II of the United Labor School. The argument between Lunacharskii and the vocationalists became so intense that Lenin himself, who it will be remembered supported the polytechnical principle, was forced to intervene in 1920. Lenin criticized both extreme positions. Being a practical man in charge of an impoverished country that demanded a great influx of trained workers, he did concede, however, that the perilous economic situation dictated that students aged thirteen and fourteen be permitted, on a temporary basis, to enroll in

specialized vocational training. In justifying this temporary measure, Lenin said:

> This is of extreme importance. We are impoverished. We must have carpenters and metal workers immediately. Without question. All must become carpenters, metalworkers, etc., but they must also have a minimal amount of general and polytechnical education.[39]

How to interpret and implement what follows the italicized conjunction but, of course, is what has harassed Soviet politicians and educators from 1920 to the present day.

Following Lenin's attempt at mediation, the last two years of the general education school were soon transferred to technicums, and the truncated general education school, now a seven-year school, acquired during the late 1920s a strong production bias.[40] The new vocational school (fabrichno-zavodskaia uchenichestuo or FZU) that emerged, on the other hand, was forced to provide its students with a strong dose of general education. This new educational system was a strange anomaly because the general school did not prepare its graduates for the university, and the graduates of the FZU normally did not go to work in industry (most workers received short-term on-the-job training in factories and plants). To prepare for the university, students had to enroll in a preparatory course or a worker's faculty (rabfak).[41]

As the polytechnical idea (broad technical education combined with general education) became dormant in both the general and vocational school, the idea of socially useful labor came to the fore and, during

the first five-year plan, reigned supreme. The project method provided the structure for organizing the public work of the students.[42]

Emphasis on socially useful labor and narrow vocational training during this period invariably lowered academic standards which permitted the training of ordinary labor but prevented the training of technically trained personnel. As Stalin began to expand industry and collectivize agriculture, it became increasingly evident that the economy now demanded a larger number of highly trained people with a solid background in mathematics and the sciences and that the educational system of the time could not fill this need. Under the new system that emerged during the 1930s, the general education school consisted of ten grades and once again prepared students for higher education, and the FZU abandoned its previous general education functions and began to prepare students strictly for employment in industry.[43]

By way of review, we see that during the first two decades of Soviet rule, polytechnical education was subjected to several shifts in interpretation and emphasis. In the first decade, polytechnical education stressed (at least in theory, if not always in practice) a general academic and technical education that prepared a young person for induction into two or more closely related occupational fields. In the late 1920s, emphasis was on narrow vocational training in a single trade. According to Nicholas DeWitt, the labor needs of industry were so great at this time that "the whole elementary- and secondary-structure--and not merely its upper levels as was originally contemplated--was swept into vocational training under the slogan that 'the school is nothing but a branch of the factory.'"[44] From the early 1930s to the late 1950s,

the concept of polytechnical education became more circumscribed than at any other period. During the Stalin reign, preparation for a specific trade was eliminated from the general education school and socially useful labor was de-emphasized. Polytechnical education now was restricted to some instruction in how natural sciences, physics, chemistry, and mathematics could be applied in basic industrial and agricultural processes.[45]

By the 1950s, the economy now demanded not more university trained personnel but a greater supply of semi-skilled laborers and technicians. With the Khrushchev educational reforms of the late 1950s, polytechnical education returned to the general education school with a flourish, this time under the guise of narrow production training. The return was shortlived. By 1964, in spite of the continuing labor shortage, most secondary general education schools no longer provided production training.[46] Yet, the idea that secondary schools should provide all students with general education combined with a polytechnical education, that includes socially useful labor and production training, was not abandoned but began to reassert itself with increasing power during the next two decades. The ascending interest in labor education is clearly revealed in the following education decrees during the 1960s and 1970s:

Decree of 23 February 1966. The Central Committee and Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. required secondary students to receive a general, polytechnical, labor education, but vocational training was to be provided only if the necessary conditions permitted it, and the "necessary conditions" were sorely lacking in most secondary schools.[47]

Decree of 25 June 1972. The Ministry of Education and local public education agencies were instructed "to develop polytechnical instruction based on the close combination of the study of school subjects and the principles of modern production. Excursions by pupils to plants, factories, state farms and collective farms are to be conducted systematically, and pupils are to be familarized with technological processes and the organization of labor at enterprises. . . . In conjunction with industrial and agricultural enterprises, training shops and school and interschool production-training workshops are to be set up and outfitted."[48]

Decree of 20 July 1973. The secondary school was supposed to prepare its students for "vigorous labor and public activity, and the conscious choice of an occupation."[49]

Decree of 29 December 1977. There was no longer any doubt that polytechnical (or labor, as it was now generally called) education would henceforth have a strong production training basis. In this decree the U.S.S.R. Central Committee and Council of Ministers complained that

> many school graduates enter life without proper labor training, lack an adequate understanding of the commonest occupations, and have difficulty in making the transition to work in the national economy. . . . In today's conditions, when the transition to universal secondary education has been carried out in the country, secondary-school graduates should have acquired, during their term of study, a thorough knowledge of the fundamentals of the sciences and labor skills for work in the national economy, and

they should have come close to mastering a specific occupation.[50] (Italics added)

When asked by a correspondent if the proposed labor training in this act represented a "return to production training," M. A. Prokof'ev, the U.S.S.R. Minister of Education, said:

> This is a fundamentally incorrect point of view. In no way should the resolution be interpreted as a return to schools with production training. Ours is a general-education, uniform, labor, polytechnical school, and in no way a vocational school. . . . Naturally, no one is going to object if youngsters who undergo intensive labor training in a production-training combine or a training shop then pass an examination for a skill category. But the school has no obligation to do this. . . ."[51] (Prokof'ev's italics)

Today, the Soviet general education school is required to do precisely what Prokof'ev denied it had any obligation to do eight years ago. According to the "Guidelines," labor training, "given the necessary conditions," must "conclude with the mastering of a specific occupation and the passing of a skill-category examination. . . ."[52] (Italics added)

What polytechnical or labor education is in theory and in practice continues to be a confusing subject to many Soviet citizens, as is illustrated by a statement made recently by a commentator for a Soviet literary newspaper in an interview with M. Kondakov, the President of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences:

> If I were to summarize our readers' mail response to the school reform, the basic question would sound like this: What is actually meant by the "labor upbringing" of youngsters? Are we talking about a shop at a plant (or a factory) to which you will take schoolchildren and say, "Learn this occupation," where you will spend considerable money on instruction, but the graduate will take it into his head not to go there after he finishes school? Or will the teenager learn to work with his hands: to whitewash a ceiling, sew a shoe, sharpen, plane, solder (I am recalling suggestions from readers' letters), drive a truck or prepare food?[53]

Kondakov's reply to this question was, "We would like to give the schoolchild both." He went on to say that the main thing is to create, "on a scientific basis," a labor training syllabus that would provide "a whole system of pedagogical actions aimed at developing labor skills in schoolchildren. They should become familiar with work materials, learn to use the simplest tools, etc. But toward the end of their school instruction they must work for a while in production and get an understanding of just what it is. They must turn out a product and earn money!"[54]

Much of the confusion about what the newest version of polytechnical labor education will entail should, presumably, be cleared up when the new syllabus is completed. Work on this syllabus has already begun, and it should be implemented sometime during the time frame 1986 through 1990. In the meantime, while we may not be able to pinpoint precisely the present interpretation of polytechnical labor

education, a general idea of what it will entail in the near future may be gleaned from the following statement in the "Guidelines":

> Elementary-school pupils (grades one through four) should master elementary techniques, needed in life, of working with one's hands with various materials, the growing of agricultural plants, the repair of visual aids, the making of toys and various useful objects for the school, the kindergarten, the home, etc. Even at this stage, a beginning can be made at familiarizing children with certain occupations that are within their comprehension.
>
> In the incomplete secondary school (grades five through nine), pupils should receive more thorough general labor training, acquire knowledge and practical skills in working with metal and wood, become familiar with the fundamentals of electrical engineering, metallurgical science and graphics, and get some idea of the main branches of the national economy. They should make simple articles on the basis of orders from enterprises, as well as articles for schools, and concern themselves about environmental protection. Beginning in the eighth grade, pupils should be trained and work in student production brigades and in inter-school production-training combines, training shops and sections at enterprises and in vocational-technical schools.
>
> In the secondary general-education school (grades ten and eleven), labor training will be organized in the most common occupations, with a view to the given region's requirements for them . . . as well as directly at production workplaces. Given the necessary conditions, it will conclude with the mastering of a specific

occupation and the passing of a skill-category examination, according to established procedures.[55]

Let me clarify here that labor education (henceforth, I shall use this term as an equivalent for polytechnical labor education) in grades ten and eleven of the general education school may take place in workshops housed in the school itself, or in shops at industrial or agricultural enterprises, or at inter-school production-training combines. The combines provide, in a central location, training in a number of occupations for students from several neighboring schools. One such combine, for example, provides training in eighteen occupations for 2,000 ninth and tenth grade students from twenty different schools. Some of the occupations students can prepare for are lathe operator, mechanic, drop-forge operator, motor vehicle driver, milling machine operator, and public service worker such as a waiter or clerk.[56]

The "Guidelines" also stipulate that the general education school should develop a sound guidance program that will enable students, upon completion of the ninth grade, to make a wise choice of an occupation and of an appropriate educational institution in which to continue their education.[57] And, finally, the "Guidelines" require each school to have a formal working relationship with an industrial enterprise or agricultural collective.[58]

In subsequent resolutions and pronouncements by officials of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Education and of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, we gain the following additional details about the proposed labor education program. Time set aside each week during the school day for "labor training" and "socially useful, productive labor"

will be increased to three hours in grades two through four, four hours in grades five through seven, six hours in grades eight and nine, and eight hours in grades ten and eleven.[59] During the summer, students will be expected to participate in an annual "labor experience." Students in grades five through seven will devote ten days to this experience; eighth and ninth grades, sixteen days; and tenth and eleventh grades, twenty days.[60]

Soviet educational leaders anticipate developing about forty labor education programs for tenth and eleventh graders, twenty to twenty-five for eighth and ninth graders, several "variants" for students in grades five through seven, and a standard program for students in grades one through four.[61] While we do not know yet what the specifics of these programs will be, we can be assured that future Soviet students will have received a heavy dose of computer instruction. Present plans call for giving ninth grade students sixty hours of computer instruction and 100 hours of laboratory work. Another eighty hours of instruction and 300 hours of laboratory work will be given these same students in the tenth and eleventh grades.[62]

To accommodate the increased time to be devoted to labor education, the length of the Soviet school year will be increased for each grade in accordance with the number of days allocated for summer labor experience,[63] and, as previously mentioned, obligatory public school attendance will be increased from ten to eleven years.

Problems

Clearly, the labor education proposed by the Soviet government for its young people is a very ambitious program. Soviet political and educational leaders are determined to prove that all normal students can profit from and cope with a required, demanding program that combines general education with labor education. It is a herculean challenge. Already, members of the Supreme Soviet's Preparatory Commission on Public Education and Culture have noted some dark clouds on the horizon. According to a report of this commission, "the organization of labor training in secondary schools raises serious questions and doubts and sometimes even causes bewilderment."[64] A "legitimate source of alarm" for members of this commission is the large amount of "obsolete and worn-out" equipment that students must use in gaining a vocational proficiency.

The critical question is, where will the money come from to replace this equipment and to build new vocational schools (not to mention other major expenditures necessary for updating textbooks, purchasing computers, training and hiring of new teachers, raising teacher salaries, etc.)? In light of Gorbachev's desire to increase capital investment in modernizing the national economy "from one-third to at least a half within the next few years," and his frank admission that this "will require enormous capital investments,"[65] it is highly possible that some of the funds originally earmarked for carrying out the educational reforms will be diverted to other projects.

The commission is also concerned about the serious shortage of pedagogically-trained labor education teachers and about the possibility

that the schools will get so "carried away with labor training" that academic learning will begin to suffer.[66] These, incidentally, are some of the same problems that forced the Soviet state to retreat from Khrushchev's effort in the late 1950s to provide students with general education and training for a specific trade.

In concluding this section, I should mention three other problems of long standing that will no doubt intensify the challenge facing Soviet educators in implementing their proposed labor education program. First, in the Soviet Union, as in the U.S. and many other countries, many students and their parents scorn physical labor.[67] Second, the specific vocational skill that an older student gains in either a general education or vocational-technical school is restricted to those vocational skills required by the industries or agricultural collectives surrounding the student's school. Since Soviet children typically go to the school nearest to where they live, it is possible that for many of these children their future occupation will be foreordained by where they live. Third, all institutions, establishments, and businesses in the U.S.S.R. are subject to quota requirements spelled out in the national plan compiled every five years by Gosplan, the state planning agency. The educational system is not exempt from this plan. It must fulfill certain quotas such as a specified enrollment figure for each school in the country. A principal in Riga noted some problems resulting from the state plan:

> Each year a school receives a plan for assigning its eighth graders. Everything is spelled out precisely and rigidly: How many are to be enrolled in the ninth grade, how many in

> vocational-technical schools, how many in technicums? If you don't fulfill the plan for assigning pupils in vocational-technical schools, you don't get a pat on the back. If you overfill it, that's bad too: There won't be enough pupils in the ninth grade. As a result, there's a process of "cautious" vocational guidance in the eighth grade--the idea is not to overdo it, to have just the right number. But after all, a great many times a school child's personal interests don't coincide with the district plan.[68]

Pressure to fulfill enrollment quotas is so great on school directors in Tashkent that they resort to "trickery to get students into the vocational-technical school."[69] The result is that of 700 students who applied to one vocational-technical school, only 380 remained. Since the "Guidelines" call for increasing the enrollment in vocational-technical schools, the drop-out problem will no doubt intensify in coming years.

Instructional Process: Content and Methodology

Prior to discussing the first proposal for reform of the instructional process, implementation of the principle of the unity of instruction and upbringing (character education), it is necessary to provide some background information about moral education in the U.S.S.R. The most important goal of education in the Soviet Union is neither academic nor vocational, but moral. As Lenin pointed out years ago, "the entire purpose of training, educating and teaching the youth of today should be to imbue them with communist ethics." In response to critics who claimed the Bolsheviks had no ethics, Lenin said:

> Is there such a thing as communist ethics . . . communist morality? Of course, there is. . . . We say morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society [the tsar and the capitalist class] and to unite all the working people around the proletariat, which is building up a new, a communist society.[70]

While present Soviet leaders no longer have to contend with the tsar or capitalists as a class, remnants of "capitalist" attitudes and behaviors such as "money-grubbing and bribery" and "the desire to grab whatever one can from society without giving it anything in return" linger on.[71] To counteract such "perversions" of socialist life, Soviet leaders in recent years have intensified the campaign to improve the process of developing boys and girls into men and women with communist ethics.

A person with communist ethics is a "builder of communism." A builder of communism thinks and acts in accordance with the dictates of the Party. Such a person is commonly referred to in Party parlance as the "new Soviet man," or simply the "new man." He is one who has developed a communist worldview and acts in accordance with this worldview. The most important features of a communist worldview are:

* Love of Labor. To overcome the historical backwardness of their country, Party leaders have put great stress on instilling in people a love of labor. A true lover of labor is one who has developed "labor discipline," which means, when stripped of Party jargon, the moral commitment to do willingly whatever job the Party dictates, regardless of how difficult or unpleasant it may be.

* Patriotism. A Soviet patriot is an internationalist who has a love of the military and motherland and a hatred of capitalists. An internationalist loves people of socialist societies and underdeveloped countries who are striving with the assistance of the Soviet government to establish communism.[72] He also loves "working people" oppressed by capitalist governments. The military is to be revered as a faithful bulwark against the ever-present danger of capitalist aggression.[73] A Soviet patriot combines a passionate love of the motherland with a strong conviction that he is living in the best of all possible worlds and that this has been made possible by the Communist Party.[74] Capitalists are to be hated not only because of their exploitation of the working man and their imperialistic designs,[75] but because of their increasing propaganda efforts "to exert a demoralizing influence on the minds of the Soviet people."[76]

* Atheism. Communists claim that religious faith is inconsistent with Marx's materialistic doctrines; that churches have always supported elite classes which gain and sustain their power and wealth through the exploitation of the working man. For these reasons, the new Soviet man must be a confirmed atheist. To believe as an atheist, however, is not enough. In their social science textbook, tenth grade Soviet students learn that "to be an atheist means not simply to be a non-religious person but to be a person who passionately and persistently fights against all forms of religion. . . ."[77]

* Collectivism. Unlike an "individualist" who selfishly works only for personal benefit, a "collectivist" subordinates his needs to the needs of the group and the larger society. According to the Soviet educator N. I. Boldyrev, "only in the collective is it possible to bring up a person with communist morals."[78]

Soviet teachers have always been expected to be models of communist virtue and to play a major role in molding the new man and woman. As early as March 1919, the Communist Party insisted that teachers be "imbued with the ideas of communism" and that the school be used to propagandize communist ideas on a "wide-scale."[79] Soviet teachers have always had a formidable ally in their upbringing work--the vast apparatus of the Soviet state. Party propagandists, youth organizations, the military, the judiciary, writers, radio, newspapers, the cinema, television--all these people, organizations, and institutions are charged by Soviet leaders to instill in youth (and adults) communist ethics. The kind of influence exerted on Soviet youth by these organizations and institutions is not left to chance. As the U.S.S.R. Minister of Education pointed out in a 1976 speech, "High moral qualities can be inculcated in an individual only through purposeful actions by the school, family, and community. Success is possible only when all three forces operate in unison and in one direction. . . ."[80]

The role of Soviet teachers in molding the new man and woman may be summed up in three words: knowledge, conviction, action. They are to provide their students with knowledge of Marxist-Leninist ideology, convince them of the validity of the principles of this ideology, and

motivate them always to act--in and out of school--in compliance with these principles. One of the major proposals of the "Guidelines" is designed to help teachers to fulfill their upbringing role. This proposal is to "purposively implement [in each grade] the principle of the unity of instruction and upbringing." That is, upbringing work must be merged, much more so than in the past, with all academic and vocational work provided by the school. For example, as noted in the "Guidelines," "in lessons in history, social studies, literature and other subjects, it is necessary to consistently instill the ability to defend one's communist convictions and implacability toward philistinism, parasitism and a consumer mentality." Further, "it is important that the teaching of both social-science and natural-science disciplines cultivate in pupils staunch materialist ideas, atheistic views, the ability to correctly explain natural and social phenomena and to act in accordance with our philosophical principles."[81]

To implement the principle of the "unity of instruction and upbringing," a new syllabus is being prepared by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences that will 1) "cover all sides of upbringing in the process of instruction, outside class and outside school work;"[82] and 2) reflect the idea proposed in the "Guidelines" that the school "become the center of upbringing work with pupils in the microborough" [the neighborhood surrounding the school].[83] That is, the school and its teachers must be the catalytic agent that encourages and assists parents, other community members, youth, cultural, and labor organizations to do their part in molding young people into good communist citizens.

Problems

It will not be easy for Soviet teachers to fulfill their upbringing role, primarily, I suspect, because of an inherent drawback to what is unquestionably the heart and soul of the upbringing process in Soviet schools--indoctrination. There are, of course, various degrees of indoctrination in schools in every country, including the U.S., but in few countries is the school indoctrination process as blatantly anti-intellectual as it is in the Soviet Union. The object of the indoctrination process in the Soviet Union is to teach students to accept uncritically and unconditionally a predetermined conclusion, such as atheism is noble and religion is wicked. Often, the conclusion must be one that is contrary to what students observe on the street and hear on Russian language broadcasts beamed to the Soviet Union by such Western stations as BBC, Vatican Radio and Voice of America. An example of such a conclusion is, "Soviet youth have a better standard of living than youth in Western countries." To inculcate this conclusion in older students is not easy, as is clearly revealed in the following lament by the head of the department of philosophy in a Soviet pedagogical institute:

> Some of our young people think that "People in the West live better." What a superficial, "pre-packaged, blue-jeans" mentality that is! However, let's not be naive: Combatting it is not so simple. To do so, a person has to know a great deal. He has to be able to present what he knows and have mastered the art of persuasion and polemic.[84]

To eliminate any doubt in the minds of students about what the conclusion must be on any social or political issue, Soviet teachers are expected to word their questions so that the question itself contains the desired answer. For example, a Soviet pedagogue quotes with approval the following "discussion" question that a teacher gave an eighth grade class: "The church claims that it always stood for the defense of the interests of its country and people. Prove that this is not so."[85] The drawback, of course, to this kind of heavy-handed indoctrination approach is that it is often counterproductive. It tends to promote boredom and skepticism in students rather than willing acceptance of the desired convictions. This drawback was noted with some alarm in the 1920s by M. S. Ephstein, a Deputy Commissar in Lunacharskii's Commissariat of Enlightenment. Ephstein cautioned that the "canonization" of Marxism in the social studies program of his day was not only dangerous but

> harmful because canonization repels the adolescent from social studies. It is awful, above all, because this kind of canonization opens the broadest paths for the most genuine kind of opportunism, emasculating the revolutionary essence of Marxism and Leninism. . .
>
> Through canonization we are training opportunists, that is, people who have no spiritual convictions, who believe in nothing, who mechanically and endlessly repeat the dogmas they have learnt . . .

> For illustration, I will give an example of the particular kind of canonization in the form of the 'Red lie' that I am talking about. . .
>
> A class is going on in the fourth grade of primary school. It is a discussion about the life and customs of the peasantry . . . before the revolution and now. You ought to hear how the teacher described the unreal life of the Soviet countryside to the peasant children in the fourth grade, where there are grown lads with a lot of experience of life, who know what the contemporary village and its life and standard of living can be. Before, said the teacher, there were no creches, no veterinary or medical centres and so on. Now they exist in abundance. With the coming of Soviet power, everything changed, as if with the waving of a magic wand. No drunkenness, religious superstitions, raping of women and so on. In short, a Communist idyll. What is the point of this? The children learn, in the first place, to be passive (everything is fine already); and, in the second place, they stop believing us.[86]

Ephstein was prophetic. Even though Soviet young people today are much more highly educated and sophisticated than those of the 1920s, teachers are still expected to perpetuate in Ephstein's words, the "Red lie," the aim of which, according to Alexander Solzhenitsyn, is, and has always been, "to conceal or distort what actually takes place."[87] One of the results of this practice is that many Soviet youngsters (and adults as well) have become in the past decade or so increasingly disillusioned with Party ideology and with those who

propagate it.[88] It is questionable that improving the Soviet upbringing process along traditional paths will dissipate this disillusionment. The probability is that disillusionment with Communist ideology will continue until such time as the Party becomes sufficiently flexible to make its ideology more consistent with the everyday world experienced by its young people and adults.

Improvement of Textbooks and Teaching Methodology

Two additional proposals for reforming the instructional process are to modernize textbooks and other instructional materials and to improve the methods of teaching. Those organizations responsible for revising textbooks have been instructed to do so "in accordance with the objectives of the schools and the new curriculum, to raise their ideological-upbringing level, and to see to it that they are accessible, have a practical bent and link one subject to another. . . ."[89]

As in the United States, in the U.S.S.R. there is widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching. According to M. A. Prokof'ev, "'Scholasticism,' associated with the unthinking memorization of educational material, is a chronic disease of the school."[90] Top Soviet educators and politicians, however, do not propose any simplistic panacea for this "disease." People responsible for educational reform in the Soviet Union do not assume that all there is to teaching is to learn well the subject matter one is going to teach, that one can learn how to teach on the job. While Soviet teachers are expected to be cultured, erudite people who know their subject and related subjects well, they are also expected to be, as the First Deputy U.S.S.R. Minister of Education pointed out in 1973, "experts on all phases of pedagogical

sciences--history, theory, didactics, methods of teaching and upbringing, as well as the psychology and physiology of children and youth."[91]

More so than any previous Soviet educational legislation, the "Guidelines" and subsequent resolutions stress the necessity of improving the methods and means of instruction and the psychological-pedagogical study of schoolchildren throughout the period of their instruction. Specifically, teachers must use more "active means of instruction," accustom pupils to work independently with books, "increase the effectiveness of the lesson as the basic form of the organization of the instructional and upbringing process," use more widely lectures and seminars in the upper grades, improve the organization of laboratory work, identify the "interests and inclinations" of children, study the "reasons for academic backwardness and shortcomings in behavior on the part of individual pupils" and select the "most effective means of eliminating these phenomena."[92]

Also emphasized is the need "to expand teachers' opportunities in selecting optimal methods, ways and means of instruction, to more boldly introduce in practice the achievements of pedagogical science, and not to permit the petty regimentation of pedagogical activity."[93]

In concluding this section, let me mention briefly three other significant reform proposals relevant to the instructional process: military training, electives, fine arts and physical education.

Military training has been an integral part of Soviet schools for a number of years, but it is a topic that has been rarely discussed in pedagogical literature. With publication of the "Guidelines," school

military training has come out of the closet. In the "Guidelines" there is an unequivocable call for improving the "military-patriotic upbringing of pupils," the purpose of which is to prepare boys for army service and girls for civil defense duty. It is not clear, however, what kind of improvements should be made. We do know that in the last two years of their secondary education, Soviet students are currently being taught such things as how to put on a gas mask, take shelter, march and perform close-order drill. Boys learn to take rifles apart and to practice with wooden grenades.[94] One-hundred and forty hours of instructional time are devoted to such activities.[95]

More so than in the past, the educational reform proposals permit students to take optional courses, but they must be additional, more in-depth courses in technical areas and in physics, chemistry, mathematics, biology, social sciences, and the humanities. In grades seven through nine, students may devote two hours per week to an in-depth course; in grades ten and eleven, four hours.[96]

From the beginning of the progressive education movement at the turn of the century until just a few years ago, there has been much talk in the United States about the school developing the "whole child," that is, developing the child mentally, socially, physically, aesthetically, morally. With the "back-to-basics" bandwagon currently in full swing, there has been headlong flight in many quarters from the whole child concept. Many schools across the nation, for example, have eliminated such "frills" as music, art, drama, physical education. In the Soviet Union, educators have for years advocated the whole child concept, though they use the phrase, development of a harmonious

personality. But unlike the U.S., in the U.S.S.R. there has been no retreat in the insistence of Soviet educational policy makers on developing young people in all the areas considered necessary to become worthwhile citizens of a socialist society.

In addition to stressing the intellectual, vocational, and moral instruction of young people, Soviet educators in recent years have given increased attention to developing a student aesthetically and physically. The "Guidelines" not only call for the school and community organizations to provide every child with daily physical exercise, but charge schools and the "artistic intelligentsia and all cultural institutions" to work together to promote the aesthetic knowledge, skill, and taste of young people. On an experimental basis, the "Guidelines" propose that "instructional and upbringing complexes" be created that "provide the opportunity to organically combine general education with musical, artistic and physical development." It is important, however, for educational institutions and youth organizations to regulate everywhere "the work of amateur performing-arts groups and pay constant attention to their repertoires."[97]

Recruitment and Training of Teachers

Recruitment and training of teachers receive considerable attention in the "Guidelines" and subsequent resolutions, for it is clearly recognized that implementation of the reform proposals "depends to a decisive degree on teachers and on their ideological conviction, professional skills, erudition and culture."[98]

Soviet professors of pedagogy, methodology, or educational psychology have as difficult a time as their American counterparts (professors of education) in attracting intellectually talented young people into teaching. The salary of Soviet teachers is very low, and their working conditions and workload would make even a "burnt-out" American teacher blush.[99] The low status of teaching accounts for the frequent complaint of Soviet pedagogues that many of their students are mediocre, enter their institutes only to get a degree, and upon graduation, if they cannot avoid teaching, change occupations as soon as possible.[100]

In recent years Soviet leaders have become increasingly sensitive to the plight of the teacher. Chernenko, for example, urged in his keynote address at the June 1983 plenary session of the Central Committee that the Communist Party "raise and protect in every way possible the prestige of the teacher, and show constant concern for improving his working and living condition. . . ."[101] Chernenko's concern has been reaffirmed in the "Guidelines" and subsequent resolutions. For example, the salaries of Soviet teachers have been raised, effective 1 September 1984, an average of thirty to thirty-five percent.[102] Class size will be gradually reduced over a period of eleven years starting in 1986.[103] Beginning also in 1986, students attending teacher training institutions will receive for the first time a stipend equal in amount to that given students in mining, metallurgical, petroleum, and forestry specialities.[104] Teachers will be assigned housing on a priority basis. In rural areas teachers will be given credit and building materials for construction of a house and will be permitted to buy food at a discount rate.[105] A new national award, the N. K. Krupskaia Prize, has been

established and will be awarded each year to 225 of the country's most distinguished teachers and other educational personnel.[106] And, finally, to honor teachers and education, September 1 has been designated as a new national holiday, to be called "Knowledge Day."[107] Establishing the awards and the Knowledge Day will not require any significant expenditure, but to fund the other projects will require a great amount of additional money. Whether the Soviet state will in fact provide the funds required for these projects remains to be seen.

According to the "Guidelines," "a significant improvement in the training of teachers is an integral part of the reform of the public education system."[108] Long-range objectives for improving the education of teachers in the U.S.S.R. are to

* create conditions that will provide all teachers with a higher education;[109] (At present, ninety-eight percent of the secondary school teachers, grades four through ten, have a higher education; but over sixty percent of the elementary school teachers have only what is roughly the equivalent of an American junior college education.)[110]
* increase the length of study in higher education institutions from four to five years for teachers of Russian language and literature, native language and literature, history, mathematics, physics, and general technical disciplines and labor;[111]
* increase significantly the number of students accepted into pedagogical schools and pedagogical institutes.[112] (Elementary teachers receive their training in pedagogical schools;

secondary teachers receive their training in pedagogical institutes and universities.)

The more immediate general charge to teacher training institutions is to provide future teachers with the "most up-to-date knowledge and good practical preparation."[113] Specifically, these institutions must

* ensure that prospective teachers in pedagogical institutes and universities have "practice teaching" experience in a public school during each year of their student career;[114]
* provide would-be teachers with the "fundamentals of modern production and the methods of vocational guidance for schoolchildren";[115]
* improve the content and organization of practical work and raise the level of psychological-pedagogical training;[116]
* expand the teaching of logic, aesthetics, ethics, Soviet law and methods of upbringing work.[117]

In addition, the research efforts of pedagogical scholars must be directed toward an "elaboration of urgent problems of the general-education and vocational schools," and the results of their research should be "embodied in concrete recommendations, study aids and methods manuals" that are comprehensible and useful for public school teachers.[118]

Problems

To do their part in implementing the proposed educational reforms, Soviet teacher educators must contend with some very complex problems, a number of which have challenged, if not frustrated, many an

American professor of education. Four problems stand out as being particularly critical. First, Soviet teacher educators must take responsibility for their graduates even though these students learn, as anybody else, by example, and the example they have before them during most of their undergraduate work is professors in the arts and sciences--not professors of education/pedagogy. As in the U.S., so in the U.S.S.R., many arts and sciences professors are indifferent teachers and have only disdain for pedagogues and the field of pedagogy.[119]

Second, Soviet teacher educators must prepare teachers to work effectively with students from all walks of life who are compelled to remain in school for eleven years in a general education school or twelve years in a vocational school. I should point out that as late as 1965, twenty-two percent of Soviet school children failed to complete the daytime eight-year general education school; and of those who did complete the eight-year school, many went directly to work or enrolled in a short-term vocational school to learn a common trade.[120] Now, children with comparable academic ability and vocational aspirations will be expected to complete an eleven year program that combines vocational training with a demanding academic program that requires, among other things, foreign language study, five years of physics, chemistry and natural sciences, and eleven years of mathematics. To prepare teachers to work effectively with older students, who have little academic ability and interest in school, will probably be as frustrating a challenge for Soviet teacher educators as it has been for their American counterparts. That this is already becoming a problem is suggested by a recent recommendation by the U.S.S.R. Minister of Education that

"temporary" special two or three month remedial classes for poor students be organized.[121]

Third, the educational reforms demand that Soviet pedagogues improve the quality of their programs and at the same time cope with the problems, such as the recruitment of qualified faculty, that are concomitant with a large increase of student enrollment. In 1983, 181,000 students were accepted into Soviet pedagogical schools and institutes. The anticipated enrollment in 1990 is 224,500.[122] The problem of obtaining quality with an expanding enrollment is compounded by the fact that Soviet pedagogues must prepare teachers not only for work in general education schools but for work in vocational schools and technicums. The problem will no doubt be intensified in coming years as more students are siphoned off from the general education school and directed to a vocational school or a technicum.

Fourth, the Soviet Union shares with the United States the problem of teaching the national language effectively to a large number of children whose native language is not the national language. There are over a hundred languages spoken in the Soviet Union. In the fifteen republics comprising the U.S.S.R., students may enroll either in a school where Russian is the language of instruction (when such schools are available) or enroll in what is called a "national school," where the language of instruction is the student's native language. In the Union republics' national schools, Russian language study is, of course, required of all students. Soviet political and educational leaders, however, frequently complain that graduates of these schools have a limited knowledge of Russian.

It is clear from the social, educational, and political problems of such countries as Canada and India, that universal knowledge of a national language is a necessary, though not a sufficient, prerequisite for national solidarity. Consequently, Soviet pedagogues are expected to respond positively to the charge in the "Guidelines" "to take additional measures to improve conditions for the study, along with one's native language, of the Russian language. . . . Fluency in the Russian language should become the norm for young people who are completing secondary educational institutions."[123] Toward this end, one of the reform proposals is to allocate in grades two through eleven in the national schools an additional two to three hours per week for the study of the Russian language.[124]

Conclusions

Like Americans, the Soviet people expect much more from their public school system than providing children only with the 3 Rs and some instruction in various academic disciplines. Both nationalities, for example, habitually look to their schools to resolve a host of social problems ranging from segregation of the races in the U.S. to alcohol addiction of boys and girls in the U.S.S.R.[125] The educational reform proposals examined in this paper reflect clearly the extraordinary non-academic demands that the Soviets put on their schools as we do on ours.

While it is true that many Americans are presently disenchanted with public school education, most Americans, in the past hundred years, have been devoted to their public schools. In their view the

public schools have "Americanized" millions of immigrants, provided the trained manpower to make America the leading industrial power of the world, and promoted the democratic way of life reflected in our constitution. With equal justification, the Soviets are proud of the many accomplishments of their educational system.

While the educational system in Russia under the tsars had expanded greatly during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, on the eve of the Bolshevik takeover of the provisional government in 1917 most Russians were still illiterate. Today, illiteracy in the Soviet Union is negligible. Practically everybody has at least eight years of general education, and the great majority of the younger generation has had ten years of general education and will soon have eleven years. The nation's schools and other educational and cultural institutions have indeed raised significantly the cultural level of the Soviet people. Furthermore, the educational system has provided the trained manpower that has enabled the U.S.S.R. to become one of the world's great industrial and military powers. These are no small accomplishments.

As Americans, of course, we find several features of the Soviet educational system to be objectionable, if not abhorrent: censorship, militant atheism, "doctoring" of historical facts to "prove" the superiority of a socialist system over that of a capitalist system, subordination of the individual to the will of the collective, and insistence that a good citizen is one who thinks and acts in accordance with the dictates of a small group of political leaders. However, our opposition to these perversions of what we would consider a liberal education should not

prevent us from acknowledging that Soviet educators are tackling some of the same problems as we. In spite of our philosophical differences about what a good education should be, Soviet educators are doing some innovative work in a number of different areas that merit our attention, in particular the following four:

First, since educational reform in the U.S. is invariably short-range and piecemeal, it should be of interest to American educational policy makers to examine how the "Guidelines" and companion resolutions provide a long-range strategy for gradual implementation, over a five to ten year period, of reforms that are closely coordinated one with the other. For example, to modernize the content of academic and technical disciplines and to improve how they are taught, classrooms must be provided with essential technological equipment; new textbooks and other teaching materials must be prepared, printed, and distributed; teachers must be taught how to use the new materials effectively; and they in turn must acquaint parents with the materials. A larger number of academically talented, dedicated young people must be encouraged to enter the teaching profession. To get such people and to keep them in teaching, the prestige of teaching must be raised; a teacher's salary, working and living conditions must be improved; and university and in-service education must provide teachers with the knowledge, skill, and attitudes necessary for life-long learning and professional development. Substantial funds must be provided to do all these things. Local conditions must be taken into consideration in determining when and how the reforms are to be implemented. The "Guidelines" and resolutions take into consideration the importance and interrelationship of all these factors.

Second, it should be beneficial to examine how Soviet pedagogues prepare public school teachers

* to motivate students to work together to achieve worthwhile goals that are a benefit to society;
* to develop in children a "harmoniously developed personality";
* to draw upon and to coordinate community resources (such as industrial enterprises and youth and cultural organizations) in furthering the education of their students;
* to teach the national language to children whose native language is not Russian.

Third, since educational reform in the U.S. is often subject to hastily implemented, simplistic panaceas that waste human and financial resources, we might give serious study to the experience of Soviet educators with controlled experimental studies that have been conducted in recent years before any proposed educational innovation is implemented on a wide scale.[126]

Fourth, and perhaps of most importance, we might study with profit how Soviet educators cope with providing a demanding eleven year academic curriculum for all students from all walks of life, and how they coordinate vocational and academic education.

We are justly proud of our national goals of freedom and individual self-reliance. Yet this pride should not prevent us from gaining some insights about imaginative educational methods and means in another society whose ends are so very different.

Notes

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Rech' na I vserossiiskom s'ezde po prosveshcheniiu," 28 August 1918 g., in V. I. Lenin o vospitanii i obrazovanii, V. P. Gruzdev, comp. (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1973), p. 294.

[2] Sheila Fitzpatrick, Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union 1921-1934 (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 7.

[3] The second volume of N. K. Krupskaia's collected pedagogical works provides an excellent introduction to progressive educational thought in the Soviet Union during the first five years of the new Soviet regime. N. K. Krupskaia: Pedagogicheskie sochineniia v shesti tomakh, eds. A. M. Arsen'eva, N. K. Goncharova, P. V. Rudneva (Moscow: "Pedagogika," 1978).

[4] "Obrashchenie narodnogo komissara po prosveshcheniiu," 29 oktiabria 1917 g.; "Polozhenie ob edinoi trudovoi shkole rossiiskoi sotsialisticheskoi federativnoi sovetskoi respubliki," 30 sentiabria 1918 g.; "Osnovnye printsipy edinoi trudovoi shkoly," 16 oktiabria 1918 g., in Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR: obshcheobrazovatel'naia shkola: Sbornik dokumentov, 1917-1973 gg. [hereafter cited as NO], A. A. Abakumov et al, comp. (Moscow: "Pedagogika," 1974), pp. 7-9, 133-137, 137-145.

[5] Larry E. Holmes, "Bolshevik Utilitarianism and Educational Experimentalism: Party Attitudes and Soviet Educational Practice, 1917-1931," History of Education Quarterly 13 (Winter 1973): 349-350.

[6] Larry E. Holmes, "Sycophants, Heroes, or Scoundrels? Soviet School Teachers and Moscow" (Paper delivered at the Southern Conference on Slavic Studies, Richmond, Virginia, 13 October 1984), pp. 5-6.

[7] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[8] "O nachal'noi i srednei shkole," 25 avgusta 1931 g.; "Ob uchebnykh programmakh i rezhime v nachal'noi i srednei shkole," 25 avgusta 1932 g.; "Ob uchebnikakh dlia nachal'noi i srednei shkoly," 12 fevralia 1933 g.; "Ob organizatsii uchebnoi raboty i vnutrennem rasporiadke v nachal'noi, nepolnoi srednei i srednei shkole," 3 sentiabria 1935 g., No, pp. 156-161, 161-164, 164-165, 170-172.

[9] Larry E. Holmes, "Vocational Education," a forthcoming entry for the Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History, p. 8.

[10] Nicholas DeWitt, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R. (Washington, D. C.: National Science Foundation, 1961), p. 13.

[11] "Iz direktive XX s"ezda KPSS po shestomu piatiletnemu planu razvitiia narodnogo khoziaistva SSSR na 1956-1960 gg.," 14-25 fevralia 1956 g.; "Ob ukreplenii sviazi shkoly s zhizn'iu i o dal'neishem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniia v strane," 12 noiabria 1958 g.; "Zakon ob ukreplenii sviazi shkolys zhizn'iu i o dal'neishem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniia v SSSR," 24 dekabria 1958 g.; "Polozhenie o srednei obshcheobrazovatel'noi trudovoi politekhnicheskoi shkole s proizvodstvennym obucheniem," 29 dekabria 1959 g., NO, pp. 46-48, 48-52, 53-60, 203-210.

[12] Holmes, "Sycophants, Heroes, or Scoundrels?" p. 14.

[13] Ibid., p. 24

[14] M. A. Prokof'ev, "The School and Its Problems" in Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 3 (March 1971), (condensed text translated in Soviet Education, 14 [February 1972]: 40).

[15] G. A. Aliyev, "First Session of the 11th USSR Supreme Soviet: On the Basic Guidelines for Reform in the General-Education and Vocational Schools," in Pravda, 13 April 1984, pp. 5-6 (condensed text translated in Current Digest of the Soviet Press [hereafter cited as CDSP], 36 [May 16, 1984]: 7).

[16] "The Basic Guidelines for Reform in the General-Education and Vocational Schools," in Pravda, 12 April 1984, pp. 3-4 (translated in CDSP, 36 [May 30, 1984]: 12-20); "On the Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People and of Working Conditions for the General Education Schools," in Pravda, 29 April 1984, pp. 1, 3 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 36 [June 6, 1984]: 16-19); "On the Improvement of the Labor Upbringing, Training and Vocational Guidance of Schoolchildren and the Organization of their Socially Useful, Productive Labor," in Pravda, 4 May 1984, p. 1 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 36 [June 6, 1984]: 19-20; "O dal'neishem razvitii sistemy professional'no-tekhnicheskogo obrazovaniia i povyshenii ee roli v podgotovke kvalifitsirovannykh rabochikh kadrov," Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 12 May 1984,p. 1.; "On Measures to Improve the Training and Advanced Training of Teaching Personnel in the System of Education and Vocational-Technical Education and Their Working and Living Conditions," in Pravda, 15 May 1984, pp. 1-2 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 36 [June 13, 1984]: 14); "O povyshenii zarabotnoi platy uchitelei

i drugikh rabotnikov narodnogo obrazovaniia," Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 24 May 1984, p. 1.

[17] M. A. Prokof'ev, "Doklad ministra prosveshchenila SSSR M. A. Prokof'eva," Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 16 July 1983, p. 3.

[18] "Basic Guidelines," pp. 13-14.

[19] F. G. Panachin, "Reforma shkoly i kommunisticheskoe vospitanie uchashchikhsia," Vospitanie shkol'nikov, no. 6 (November-December 1984): 4. Panachin is currently First Deputy Minister of Education of the U.S.S.R.

[20] "Basic Guidelines," p. 13. To accommodate the anticipated increased enrollment, the Soviet state plans on building 800 vocational-technical schools in the next five years. G. A. Aliyev, "First Session of the 11th Supreme Soviet," p. 7.

[21] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works in Two Volumes (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1962), p. 54.

[22] "Osnovnye printsipy edinoi trudovoi shkoly," NO, pp. 142-143.

[23] Yuri Kanin, "The Economy and Well-being," Moscow News, 6-13 January 1985, p. 12.

[24] V. P. Tomin, Standards of Public Education in the U.S.S.R. (Moscow: Finances and Statistics, 1981), (Part I translated in Soviet Education, 26 [May-June 1984]: 51).

[25] Leslie Gelb, "What We Really Know about Russia," The New York Times Magazine, 28 October 1984, p. 78.

[26] "Changing the Guard," Newsweek (March 25, 1985): 26-27.

[27] V. I. Lenin: Selected Works, 3 vols. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, n.d.), 1: 716.

[28] K. U. Chernenko, To Perfect Developed Socialism and Fight for World Peace: A Collection of Speeches and Statements March-April (Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1984), p. 10.

[29] M. S. Gorbachov, "The Fundamental Issue in the Party's Economic Policy," in Pravda, 12 June 1985 (Translated in Moscow News, no. 25, 1985: 2).

[30] Karl Marx, The General Council of the First International 1864-1866 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, n.d.), p. 345.

[31] "Editor's Introduction," Soviet Education 18 (December 1975): 3.

[32] Nicholas DeWitt, "Polytechnical Education and the Soviet School Reform," Harvard Education Review 30 (Spring 1960): 96. For a comprehensive overview of labor education in the Soviet general education school, see the ten articles translated in Soviet Education 18 (December 1975): 5-106.

[33] "Editor's Introduction," Soviet Education 19 (September 1977): 3.

[34] "Ustav edinoi trudovoi shkoly," 18 dekabria 1923 g., NO, p. 146.

[35] "Osnovnye printsipy edinoi trudovoi shkoly," 16 oktiabria 1918 g., NO, 139.

[36] Ibid., p. 138.

[37] Iu. Borisov, "Moving to Unify the General Education and Vocational Schools," in Kommunist, no. 4, 1984, pp. 69-74 (translated in Soviet Education, 27 [April-May 1985]: 42).

[38] Iu. Borisov, "Realization of the Communist Party's Program for the Development of Public Education," in Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 7 (July 1983), pp. 3-13, (translated in Soviet Education, 27 [March 1975]: 15).

[39] Lenin, "O politekhnicheskom obrazovanii i zametiki na tezisy Nadezhdy Konstantinovny," in V. I. Lenin o vospitanii i obrazovanii, p. 3.

[40] Borisov, "Realization of the Communist Party's Program," p. 15.

[41] Fitzpatrick, p. 234.

[42] Ibid., p. 150.

[43] Holmes, "Vocational-Technical Education," p. 8.

[44] DeWitt, "Polytechnical Education and the Soviet School Reform," p. 101.

[45] Two representative articles that illustrate how various academic courses can have a polytechnical orientation are: G. I. Belen'kii, "The Role of Literature in the Labor Education of Pupils," in Sovetskaia Pedagogika, (March 1975), (translated in Soviet Education, 18 [October 1976]: 68-76); M. Kashin, "Concerning the Results of the Soviet School's Adoption of the New Curriculum," in Narodnoe obrazovanie, no. 6, 1976, pp. 107-127 (translated in Soviet Education, 19 [May 1977]: 65-66).

[46] Borisov, "Moving to Unify the General Education and Vocational Schools," p. 44.

[47] "O chastichnom izmenenii trudovoi podgotovki v srednei obshcheobrazovatel'noi shkole," 23 fevralia 1966 g., NO, p. 219.

[48] "Resolution on Secondary Education," in Pravda, 25 June 1972, p. 1 (translated in CDSP, 24 [July 17, 1972]: 14).

[49] "The Principles of Legislation of the U.S.S.R. and the Union Republics on Public Education," in Pravda, 21 July 1973, pp. 1-3 (translated in CDSP, 25 [August 29, 1973]: 13).

[50] "In the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers," in Pravda, 29 December 1977, pp. 1-2 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 24 [January 25, 1977]: 7).

[51] "Prokofyev Explains Schools' Changing Role," in Izvestia, 10 January 1978, p. 2 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 30 [February 1, 1978]: 7). S. G. Shcherbakov recently replaced Prokof'ev as U.S.S.R. Minister of Education.

[52] "Basic Guidelines," p. 16.

[53] M. Kondakov, "Having Trouble Learning--' But Why?" in Literaturnaya gazeta, 5 September 1984, p. 10 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 36 [October 17, 1984]: 9).

[54] Ibid.

[55] "Basic Guidelines," p. 16.

[56] A. Marinich, "Labor From an Early Age," in Pravda, 18 January 1978, p. 3 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 30 [February 15, 1978]: 24).

[57] "Basic Guidelines," p. 15.

[58] Ibid., p. 17.

[59] "Improvement of the Labor Upbringing, Training and Vocational Guidance of Schoolchildren," p. 19.

[60] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 16.

[61] I. Mel'nikov, "Soveshchanie rukovodiashchikh rabotnikov narodnogo obrazavaniia," Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 11 (November 1984): 12.

[62] Gary Thatcher, "Computer Age Comes to the Soviet Union," Christian Science Monitor, 5 March 1985, p. 40. For a discussion of the school computer curriculum by Soviet educators, see "Ob informatike v rezhime dialoga," Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 16 July 1985, p. 2.

[63] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 16.

[64] I. Ovchinnikova, "Preparing for the USSR Supreme Soviet Session," in Izvestia, 27 October 1984, p. 3 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 36 [November 21, 1984]: 27).

[65] Gorbachov, "The Fundamental Issue in the Party's Economic Policy," p. 2.

[66] Ovchinnikova, "Preparing for the USSR Supreme Soviet Session," p. 27.

[67] S. E. Khoze, Pedagogicheskii kollektiv i komsomol'skaia organizatsiia shkoly, 2nd ed., rev. and enl. (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1976), p. 138.

[68] G. Bikson, "School Desk and Workbench," in Literaturnaia gazeta, 31 August 1983, pp. 11, 15 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 35 [November 2, 1983]: 5).

[69] G. Dimov and E. Maksimova, "How Relations Stand between the School, the Vocational-Technical School and the Family," in Izvestia, 24

May 1975, p. 5 (translated and abstracted in CDSP, 27 [June 18, 1975]: 23).

[70] Lenin on Public Education (Moscow: Progress, 1975), p. 90.

[71] CPSU Central Committee Resolution, "On the Further Improvement of Ideological and Political-Upbringing Work," in Pravda, 6 May 1979, pp. 1-2 (translated in CDSP, 31 [May 30, 1979]: 8).

[72] "Iz programmy Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soiuza priniata XXII s"ezdom KPSS," 17-31 oktiabria 1961 g., NO, pp. 66-68.

[73] An examination of the basic reading textbooks used in the first three grades of the Soviet general education school suggests the importance attached to developing in children a love of the military. In each of these books, an entire chapter is devoted to stories and poems praising the military. See Rodnaia rech': Kniga dlia cheteniia v pervom klasse, M. S. Vasil'eva, et al. comp. (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1980); Rodnaia rech': Kniga dlia cheteniia vo vtorom klasse, M. S. Vasil'eva, et al. comp. (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1977); Rodnaia rech': Kniga dlia cheteniia v tret'em klasse, ed. G. N. Moravskaia (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1977).

[74] "Ob usilenii nauchno-ateisticheskogo vospitaniia uchashchikhsia srednei obshcheobrazovatel'noi shkoly: Metodicheskie rekomendatsii," 15 iiulia 1974 g., in Vospitatel'naia rabota v shkole: Sbornik dokumentov, V. M. Korotov, comp. (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1976), p. 106.

[75] N. G. Ogurtsov, "Didakticheskie problemy formirovaniia kommunisticheskogo mirovozzreniia shkol'nikov," in Problemy formirovaniia kommunisticheskogo mirovozzreniia, eds. M. H. Alekseev and N. G. Ogurtsov (Minsk: "Narodnaia Asveta," 1975), p. 115.

[76] Leonid I. Brezhnev, "Report to the Congress - II," in Pravda, 24 February 1981, pp. 2-9 (translated in CDSP, [April 1, 1981]: 13).

[77] G. Kh. Shakhnazarov et al., Obshchestvovedenie: Uchebnik dlia vypusknogo klassa srednei shkoly i srednikh spetsial'nykh uchebnykh zavedenii, 4th ed. (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1966), pp. 296-301. The meticulous, intense attention that Soviet educators are now giving to atheistic education is revealed in such representative articles as: I. A. Galitskaia and N. T. Abramova, "Atheisticheskoe vospitanie shkol'nikov, Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 1 (January 1984): 92-99; Metodicheskoe pis'mo Ministerstva prosveshcheniia SSSR, "Nauchno-atheisticheskoe vospitanie-vazhnoe napravlenie ideologicheskoi raboty," Vospitanie shkol'nikov, no. 1 (January-February 1983): 20-23.

[78] N. I. Boldyrev, Nravstvennoe vospitanie shkol'nikov: Voprosy teorii (Moscow: "Pedagogika," 1979), p. 147. For more detailed information about what the "new man" should be and what the role of the school should be in developing such a person, see the Boldyrev book just cited and V. M. Korotov, comp., Vospitatel'naia rabota v shkole: Sbornik dokumentov.

[79] "Iz programmy RKP(b)," 18-23 marta 1919, NO, pp. 18-19.

[80] M. A. Prokof'ev, "Problems of the School under the Tenth Five-Year Plan in Light of the Decision of the Twenty-Fifth Congress of the CPSU," in Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 7 (July 1976), (translated in Soviet Education, 19 [November 1976]: 84).

[81] "Basic Guidelines," pp. 13, 15.

[82] I. Mar'enko, "Puti sovershenstvovaniia kommunisticheskogo vospitaniia shkol'nikov," Vospitanie shkol'nikov, no. 2 (March-April, 1984): 3.

[83] "Basic Guidelines," p. 18.

[84] D. Skudayev, "'Who Needs a 'Quiet' Zone,'" in Komsomol'skaia pravda, 6 March 1981, p. 2 (translated in CDSP, 33 [April 8, 1981]: 20).

[85] V. A. Krutetskii, Psikhologiia obucheniia u vospitaniia shkol'nikov (Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1976), p. 207.

[86] Quoted in Fitzpatrick, p. 39.

[87] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "How Communism Cripples Nations," Samizdat Bulletin, 120 (April 1983): 4.

[88] John Bushnell, "The New Soviet Man Turns Pessimist," in The Soviet Union Since Stalin, Stephen F. Cohen et al. ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), pp. 179-199; George Feifer, "Russian Disorders," Harpers (February 1981): 41-55.

[89] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 17.

[90] Prokof'ev, "Problems of the School Under the Tenth Five-Year Plan in Light of the Decisions of the Twenty-Fifth Congress of the CPSU," p. 81.

[91] F. G. Panachin, "Urgent Problems in Teacher Training in the Ninth Five-Year Plan," in Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 6 (June 1972), (condensed text translated in Soviet Education, 15 [July 1973]: 7).

[92] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 17.

[93] Ibid.

[94] Vera Rich, "'Reforms in Soviet Union to Implement 'Leninist Aims!'" International Herald Tribune, 16 May 1984, pp. 7-8; Caleb Daniloff, "An American in a Soviet School," International Herald Tribune, 16 May 1984, p. 8.

[95] Panachin, "Reforma shkoly," p. 5.

[96] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 16.

[97] "Basic Guidelines," pp. 15-16.

[98] Ibid., p. 18.. For an excellent recent article by a Soviet educator on problems of teacher education, see D. M. Zabrodin, "Aktual'nye zadachi pedagogicheskikh vuzov," Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 12 (December 1983): 72-78.

[99] I. A. Tropin, "Go on Duty Please," in Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 7 January 1978, p. 2 ((condensed text translated in CDSP, 30 [February 8, 1978]: 7, 24).

[100] I. Naumchenko and N. Mitrofanova, "Division for Future Teachers," in Izvestia, 12 February 1976, p. 5 (translated and abstracted in CDSP, 29 [March 10, 1976]: 24).

[101] K. U. Chernenko, "Urgent Questions of the Party's Ideological and Mass-Political Work," in Pravda, 15 June 1983, pp. 1-3 (condensed text translated in CDSP, 35 [July 13, 1983]: 8).

[102] "O povyshenii zarabotnoi platy uchitelei," p. 1. Even with this substantial salary increase, Soviet teachers will still be making less money than industrial workers.

[103] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 18.

[104] "On Measures to Improve the Training and Advanced Training of Teaching Personnel," p. 14.

[105] "V tsentral'nom komitete KPSS i sovete ministrov SSSR," Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 15 May 1984, p. 1.

[106] "Measures to Improve the Training and Advanced Training of Teaching Personnel," p. 14.

[107] "Basic Guidelines," p. 19.

[108] Ibid., p. 18.

[109] Ibid.

[110] "V ministerstve prosveshchenlia SSSR," Uchitel'skaia gazeta, 29 September 1984, p. 3.

[111] "Measures to Improve the Training and Advanced Training of Teaching Personnel," p. 14.

[112] "Basic Guidelines," p. 19. Pedagogical schools are specialized secondary educational institutions that offer a four-year course for graduates of the eight-year general education school, and a two-year course for graduates of the ten-year general education school. Pedagogical institutes are four- or five-year single-purpose institutions that accept only students with a secondary education diploma.

[113] "Basic Guidelines," p. 18.

[114] "Measures to Improve the Training and Advanced Training of Teaching Personnel," p. 14.

[115] "Basic Guidelines," p. 18.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid., p. 19.

[119] Panachin, "Urgent Problems," p. 7.

[120] Prokof'ev, "The School and Its Problems," p. 40.

[121] I. Mel'nikov, "Soveshchanie rukovodiashchikh rabotnikov narodnogo obrazovaniia," p. 9.

[122] I. Mel'nikov and S. Titovich, "Reforma obshcheobrazovatel'noi i professional'noi shkoly: zadachi i puti realizatsii," Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 8 (August 1984): 16-17.

[123] "Basic Guidelines," p. 14.

[124] "Further Improvement of the General Secondary Education of Young People," p. 16.

[125] In English, the best sources of current information about education in the Soviet Union are Soviet Education, a monthly journal of translations published by M. E. Sharpe, Inc., and the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, a weekly journal of translations published by the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. Three of the best recent books in English on contemporary Soviet education are John Dunstan, Paths to Excellence and the Soviet School (Windsor, Berks: NFER, 1978); Mervyn Matthews, Education in the Soviet Union (London, Boston, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1982); J. J. Tomiak, ed., Soviet Education in the 1980s (London and Canberra: Croom Helm; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983).

[126] See, for example, the following two Soviet articles on experimental teacher education programs: I. D. Kartseva, "Novaia uchebno-metodicheskaia dokumentatsiia dlia institutov," Sovetskaia

pedagogika, no. 10 (October 1983): 63-67; A. N. Boiko, "Edinstvo teorii i praktiki v podgotovke uchitelia," Sovetskaia pedagogika, no. 1 (January 1985): 63-69.

Occasional Papers published by the Comparative Education Center

State University of New York at Buffalo

1. Philip G. Altbach and Gail P. Kelly, Comparative Education: A Preliminary Bibliography (April, 1981), OUT OF PRINT (A revised and expanded version of this paper has been published by Praeger Publishers under the title of International Bibliography of Comparative Education). This volume is available directly from the publisher, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, 10017.

2. Chuka Okonkwo, Language in African Education: A Comparative Analysis of the Curricular Elements of School Texts (May, 1978). OUT OF PRINT

3. Lois Weis, Schooling, Attitudes and Modernization: The Case of Ghana (Spring, 1979). OUT OF PRINT

4. Burton Clark, Internationalizing Higher Education: Report of Conference (April, 1979). OUT OF PRINT

5. Philip G. Altbach, The Academic Profession: Perspectives on an International Crisis (With Bibliography), (November, 1979).

6. Gail P. Kelly, The Professionalization of Teachers and the Distribution of Classroom Knowledge: Perspectives from Colonial Vietnam (September, 1980).

7. John Bodnar, Vandra Masemann, Ray C. Rist, Multicultural Education: Perspectives for the 1980s (November, 1980). OUT OF PRINT

8. Michael W. Apple and Philip Wexler, New Directions in Education: Critical Perspectives (1981). OUT OF PRINT

9. Karen Biraimah, Unequal Knowledge Distribution: The Schooling Experience in a Togolese Secondary School (1981).

10. Lois Weis, ed., Issues in Education: Schooling and the Reproduction of Class and Gender Inequalities (1982). OUT OF PRINT

11. Gail P. Kelly, "When I Become a Fonctionnaire": School Knowledge in French Colonial Africa (1984).

12. Kowsar P. Chowdhury, Efforts in Universalization of Primary Education: The Case of Bangladesh (1984).

13. Excellence, Reform and Equity in Education: An International Perspective (Essays by Rosemary Deem, Michael W. Apple, Miriam E. David, and Henry Giroux)

14. Educational Reform in the Soviet Union, by Delbert Long.

PAPERS ARE AVAILABLE FOR $5 EACH, POSTPAID. PLEASE SEND A CHECK MADE OUT TO COMPARATIVE EDUCATION CENTER AND SEND TO THE CENTER, 428 BALDY HALL, SUNY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260 U.S.A.